

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections 35 USC 112

Claims 15-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 15 has been amended to correct the informality noted by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections based on Prior Art

Claims 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Isao (JP 04 093080). Claims 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ahn et al. (5,342,796). Claims 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isao (JP 04 093080) or Ahn et al. (5,342,796) taken with Jeuch et al (4,939,100) and Lee et al (5,583,064). Claims 18-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isao (JP 04 093080) taken with Bronner et al. (5,362,663). Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isao (JP 04 093080) or Ahn et al (5,342,796) taken with Rodder et al (5,079,180).

Claim 15 has been amended to more clearly set forth a structural combination that is not specifically taught or even suggested by any of the references cited, either taken singly or in combination.

Claim 15, as amended, recites, among other recitations:

“in which a position where an impurity concentration of source/drain regions in the direction of depth is maximum almost coincides with a position where an impurity concentration of the source/drain extension regions in the direction of depth is maximum”.

This feature provides advantage that the series resistance between the source and the drain is lower than that of a conventional LDD structure, and the operation speed of the MISFET can be improved. Furthermore, the peak impurity concentration of the source/drain regions 7 and the depth of the source/drain junctions can be increased without increasing a short-channel effect.

Neither Isao nor Ahn et al teaches or suggests this feature. Hence, claim 15, as amended, and its dependent claim 16 define an invention patentably distinct from the teachings of Isao and Ahn et al.

The Examiner has further relied on Jeuch et al. (4,939,100), Lee et al. (5,583,064), Bronner et al. (5,362,663), and Rodder et al. (5,079,180), to reject claims 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b).

However, none of these references teaches or suggests the above-mentioned feature recited in amended claim 15. Since claims 17-20 depend upon claim 15, then these claims are not obvious from the combinations of the references recited by the Examiner, and believed to be patentable over the prior art reference combinations.


New claim 35 depends from and further limits claim 15 and thus, should also be allowable.

In view of the foregoing, the claims are now believed to be in form for allowance, and such action is hereby solicited. If any point remains in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Pillsbury Winthrop LLP

By: 
Glenn J. Perry
Reg. No.: 28458
Tel. No.: (703) 905-2161
Fax No.: (703) 905-2500

GJP\jjg
1600 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102

(703) 905-2000